

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please add reference numeral 4 and associated lead line to Figure 1. In accordance with the rules, a replacement drawing sheet which is labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the top margin is attached.

REMARKS

The present application has been amended in response to the Examiner's Office Action to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant, by the amendments presented above, has made a concerted effort to present claims which clearly define over the prior art of record, and thus to place this case in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for not showing every feature of the invention. Figure 1 has been amended to include reference numeral 4 and associated lead line.

With regard to the claims, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 as failing to comply with the written description requirement, the Examiner rejected claim 5 as being indefinite, and the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 as being unpatentable over United States Patent Nos. 3,255,758 (Gauche) and 5,275,439 (Hawes, Jr. et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant does not believe it is necessary to provide standard textbook advice on welding synthetic plastics. This heating of abutting plastics to cause partial melting, by an ultrasonic means has been known and practiced for decades, worldwide. It is submitted that the creation of Applicant's sleeve 6 could not be simpler. The top edge of each side panel 3 is folded over to an extent required to form a loop of dimensions to accommodate the cross section chosen for the rod 8, and welded.

Regarding the length 2 of reinforcing webbing this is, as is apparent from page 3 line 23, and from Figure 1, simply a strip of reinforcing plastic again welded to the outside of each panel 3 just below a sleeve 6, as shown in Figure 1. Again it is submitted that from page 3 line 23 and

from Figure 1, it would be readily apparent to a person skilled in the art as to how and where to weld a strip of plastics to each panel 3.

Finally, regarding the provision of a plastics sheath on a metal rod, techniques for applying a plastics coating to a metal article such as dripping or spraying have also been known and practiced for decades and it is submitted such elementary manufacturing steps do not require to be set out in detail, because if trial and error proves insufficient, then a host of text books are available.

In connection with the lack of inventive step objection raised, the Examiner comments that Gauch discloses the claimed device (presumably of Claim 1) except for the file being made with synthetic plastics material. Applicant respectfully submits that this is an inaccurate assertion. Apart from the shortcoming pointed out by the Examiner (Gauch teaching column 2 lines 29, 30) the use "of paper, flexible cardboard or the like", Applicant's Claim 1 also calls for

(i) a **bulbous** lower portion - whereas the lower portion of Gauch is a "V", as shown in Figure 1; and

(ii) upper edges of the pocket **welded** - whereas Gauch, not employing a synthetic plastics but **paper** etc. would not weld at all, but would use an adhesive to hold the loops or folds 4 in position, as indicated by the sectioning just beyond the end of the lead line of reference numeral 14.

Consequently, it is submitted that Gauch lacks not one, but **three** features of Applicant's Claim 1.

Furthermore, even if Hawes disclosed these three missing features (which it does not) it is

submitted that a '103 objection asserting the obviousness combination of three features from Hawes, with the teachings of Gauch to arrive at the present Claim 1 cannot be sustained. From a review of Hawes, it is clear from column 2 line 9 that Hawes envisaged the "folding of a sheet of heavy duty paper" which is then "glued" (column 2 line 13), although Hawes indicates at Claim 2 lines 61, 62 that the folder 10 "may be made of coloured paper, PLASTIC and film". In Hawes Figure 2, it will be observed that the folder 10 is sectioned as paper, with the upper and lower reinforcing loops 24 sectioned as **plastics**.

However, even assuming that Hawes taught a **plastics** pocket 14, with **plastic** reinforcing loops 24 laminated to the plastics pocket 14, the teaching of Hawes does not provide Gauch with the missing components.

Firstly, Hawes, like Gauch, does not teach a bulbous lower portion, but rather a "V"-shaped portion. The bulbous shape of the lower portion of Applicant's suspension file is a significant feature, as is apparent from page 2 lines 6-11.

Secondly, Hawes does not teach two **tubular** sleeves, as required by Applicant's Claim 1. Column 2 lines 62-65 state that **slots** are formed to receive hanging rods 20, and the latter are of oblong section to fit the slots, as indicated in Figure 2.

The Examiner's comments regarding the remaining sub-claims are noted, but as they are all appended to what is believed to be an allowable Claim 1, the sub-claims can properly remain.


In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are patentable over the prior art and it is therefore requested that this application be passed to issuance. Should the present claims not be deemed adequate to effectively define

the patentable subject matter, the Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned attorney of record to discuss the claims in an effort to reach an agreement toward allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 11, 2006

By: _____


Richard A. Giangiori, Reg. No. 24,284
James R. Foley, Reg. No. 39,979
Attorneys for Applicant
Trexler, Bushnell, Giangiori,
Blackstone & Marr, Ltd.
105 West Adams Street, 36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603-6299
Tel: (312) 704-1890

9E8291 WPD

Serial No.: 10/802,223

Art Unit: 3782

Page 8